

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-28 are pending in this application, with Claims 1, 11, 15, 17, 24, 25 and 28 being independent. Claims 25-28 have been added.

Applicants submit that support for the new claims can be found in the original disclosure, and therefore no new matter has been added.

Claims 17-18, 20, and 21 stand rejected under 35.U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the U.S. Patent No. 5,703,717 (Ezra, et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,663,831 (Mashitani, et al.). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

As recited in Claim 17, the present invention includes, *inter alia*, the features of a second optical member, placed between a display device and a mask member, wherein the second optical member includes a vertical lenticular lens having a periodic structure in a horizontal direction and comprising a plurality of elementary optical elements, and wherein the vertical lenticular lens and the mask member are spaced apart by substantially the same distance as the focal distance of one of the elementary optical elements of the vertical lenticular lens. This arrangement helps prevent crosstalk between parallax images and provides a bright, high-quality image. Applicants submit that the cited art fails to disclose or suggest at least those features.

Ezra, et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least the feature of a mask member. Mashitani fails to remedy the deficiencies of Ezra, et al., because Mashitani fails to disclose or suggest at least the feature of a distance between a mask member and a vertical lenticular lens. Accordingly, Applicants submit that even if the teachings of those patents

could properly be combined, the combination would not result in a device having at least the above-mentioned features recited in independent Claim 17.

Claims 1-5 and 7-24 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5, 13, 15-25, 27-33 and 35-38 of copending Application No. 09/836,368.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action fails to properly set forth even a *prima facie* rejection. The Office Action concedes that the claims of this application are not identical with those of the co-pending application, but then it merely asserts that the claims of the instant application are obvious over those of the co-pending application. The Office Action does not identify what the specific differences are or provide any reasoning as to why such differences would have been obvious. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that no *prima facie* basis for this rejection has been established.

Moreover, since the co-pending application has not been allowed and this is merely a provisional rejection, Applicants submit that the pending claims should be allowed.

Regarding new Claims 25-27, the present invention as recited in those claims includes, *inter alia*, the features of dividing a parallax image for a left eye and a parallax image for a right eye into a plurality of stripe images whose lengths in a horizontal direction are longer than lengths in the other direction, and displaying a plurality of pixels of synthesized parallax images by respectively arranging stripe images of the parallax image for the left eye and stripe images of the parallax image for the right eye in a vertical direction side by side and synthesizing the arranged stripe images. With these features, a

higher resolution image can be provided in a horizontal direction, which is the direction in which a person is most sensitive to resolution because the right and left eyes are aligned horizontally. Applicants submit that the cited art, whether considered individually or in combination, does not disclose or suggest at least these features.

Regarding new independent Claim 28, the present invention recited in that claim includes an image display element for respectively dividing a parallax image for a left eye and a parallax image for a right eye into a plurality of stripe images and displaying a plurality of pixels of synthesized parallax images by respectively arranging stripe images of the parallax image for a left eye and stripe images of the parallax image for a right eye in a vertical direction side by side and synthesizing the arranged stripe images. With these features, parallax images for left and right eyes can be provided respectively to left and right eyes of a user in a horizontal surface, and a top of a first lens, a center of an opening portion or shield part, and a top of a second lens can be positioned on a line connecting positions of the left eye and the right eye. As a result, off-axis aberration can be reduced and a high quality image with high resolution and less aberration can be provided to an observer. Applicants submit that the cited art, whether considered individually or in combination, does not disclose or suggest at least these features.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that all claims are patentable over the cited art and that this case is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants
Brian L. Klock
Registration No. 36,570

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
BLK/lmj

DC_MAIN 168887v1